



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

modified their domestic arrangements, made personal sacrifices, in order that, with the aid of the pension, they might be able to retire and carry through without distraction some project of study or of literary production. Some, expecting an early relief from all teaching duties, have foregone leaves of absence which they might have claimed; some have taught in summer schools or night schools who would not otherwise have done so; some have made investments or taken insurance with express reference to the time of their prospective retirement. After institutions, families and individuals have thus, for nearly four years, been permitted and encouraged by the Carnegie Foundation to be vitally influenced in the conduct of their affairs by an expectation based upon the foundation's explicit announcement, the entire system of service pensions is now abruptly abolished, "except in the case of disability unfitting" the applicant "for work as a teacher as shown by medical examination"—which, of course, is purely a disability pension.

The question whether the scheme of service pensions for professors under sixty-five and in good health was originally a wise one I do not here discuss; it is a question of policy concerning which a good deal might be said on either side. But two considerations in the matter seem so plain as to afford no ground for differences of opinion. One is that, unless the Carnegie Foundation is to be guilty of an act of bad faith it should promptly supplement its recent action by the proviso that at least all persons within ten years of the time of eligibility for a service pension, under the old rule, may still claim such pension when their time comes around. The other patent fact is that, unless so supplemented, the latest action of the foundation must hereafter render impossible any confidence in the stability of policy of that corporation. In the federal act of incorporation by which the foundation received legal entity two classes of prospective beneficiaries are specifically distinguished and equally emphasized: college teachers "who by reason of long and meritorious service or by reason of old age, disability,

or other sufficient reason" shall be deemed entitled to pensions. The service-pension feature has similarly been especially emphasized in the public reports and explanations of policy of the president of the foundation. A body which at a moment's notice abandons one of the two purposes constituting its proclaimed *raison d'être* is equally likely to modify the other to any assignable degree.

I can scarcely suppose that any one will think it relevant to note that the foundation has always retained the power to alter its rules "in such a manner as experience may indicate as desirable." All public bodies, doubtless, have such power to amend their regulations; but it is not commonly conceived that the power can justly be exercised in such a way as to have a retroactive effect, or to nullify equities acquired or expectations reasonably aroused by virtue of the previous regulations.—Arthur O. Lovejoy in *The Nation*.

THE PRINCETON GRADUATE COLLEGE

YESTERDAY'S decision by the Princeton trustees seems to have met the question immediately at issue in a way both happy and just. Few details are as yet published, but the main points are clear. Two gifts for the endowment of a graduate college had been offered, one apparently conditioned upon a site on or near the campus, the other contemplating a location at a distance from it. There were also questions about the control of the new institution by the academic governing body of the university. Because it was found impossible to unite the two foundations, or otherwise to reconcile the differences about administration, the larger gift was withdrawn. While regretting this, and hoping that an adjustment may yet be found, the trustees distinctly uphold President Wilson. He was right, they decide, in insisting upon a proper university control of the proposed graduate college, and upon its being absorbed into the common academic life at Princeton. Yet they distinctly refer to "dissensions" in the faculty and in the governing board which it will be the duty of the trustees to grapple with in the near future. Thus the particular dispute

is seen to be merged in the larger and general question.

What that is at Princeton, it is perfectly well known. President Wilson has left his attitude in no doubt. He is for the freest and fullest play of the democratic spirit in colleges, and as a means of securing it at Princeton urged the system of dormitories in which all the students should live. This involved the abolition of the expensive and exclusive clubs which have been so marked a feature of life at Princeton. But though the faculty approved a proposal which many considered revolutionary, the trustees have thus far declined to give their assent to it. This is clearly the question about which the "dissensions" have sprung up, involving as is known a great deal of bitter feeling with rumors that President Wilson would be forced to resign.—*New York Evening Post*.

An attitude was taken towards Mr. Proctor's generosity in regard to Princeton's long-professed hope, he was catechized in such a manner in regard to what he was attempting with commendable forbearance to do for his Alma Mater, that, as Mr. Pyne said in the statement he felt it necessary to make public, "From the start his generosity has met with such an extraordinary reception, his motives have been so misconstrued, his patience has been so sorely tried that self-respect has at last demanded the withdrawal of his princely gift. Thus at least \$900,000 has been lost to Princeton by the treatment he has received."

The recent meeting of the Board of Trustees closed one act of this remarkable drama—with an anti-climax. It has by no means settled the matter. We have merely lost a Graduate College, with very little chance now of getting one. But the controversy over the issues raised seems only to have begun. The object of the recent meeting of the board was to call a truce. . . . To state, therefore, as most of the newspapers did, that Mr. Pyne and the other members of the board who were not in accord with the treatment by the Committee of Five of Mr. Proctor's offer were won over from their position is about as far from the truth as it could be. They stand exactly

where they stood before, only more staunchly so, more indignantly so, and have expressed the desire to have this clearly recognized.

—Jesse Lynch Williams in *The Princeton Alumni Weekly*.

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

New Manual of Botany of the Central Rocky Mountains (Vascular Plants). By JOHN M. COULTER. Revised by AVEN NELSON. New York, American Book Company. January, 1910.

When the present reviewer landed in America, in 1887, his first purchase was a copy of Coulter's "Manual of Rocky Mountain Botany," at that time rather recently published. In his subsequent wanderings over the state of Colorado, this volume was his inseparable companion, proving itself a most serviceable hand-book to the flora of the region. In those days it was innocently supposed that the Rocky Mountain flora had been nearly all described, and if a plant did not altogether agree with any of the descriptions, it was generally assumed that the species must be variable. It was not possible for the worker in the field to discover that numerous species, supposed to be identical with those of distant regions, were in reality quite distinct.

About the year 1894 there began a new era in the study of Rocky Mountain plants. The material in the herbaria was scrutinized anew, and many collections were made in different parts of Montana, Wyoming and Colorado. Presently new species began to be described, and new generic names proposed. The activity increased until the output was astonishing, and this has continued down to the present time. The old manual no longer represented the knowledge of the day, and a new edition was planned. This was placed in the hands of Professor Aven Nelson, of the University of Wyoming, who has been a much larger contributor to the knowledge of Rocky Mountain plants than all the other residents of that region combined. The appearance of the new book was looked forward to with extreme interest and impatience by students of this flora, and now that it is out, many are the discus-